



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

MAR

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,603	09/17/2001	Craig N. Eatough	8333	8272
7590	02/25/2004		EXAMINER	
Foster & Foster, LLC Mr. Lynn G. Foster 602 E. 300 S. Salt Lake City, UT 84102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Notification of Non-Compliance With 37 CFR 1.192(c)</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/954,603	<b>Applicant(s)</b> EATOUGH ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> AOD Alexa A. Doroshenk	<b>Art Unit</b> 1764

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 01 December 2003 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file IN TRIPPLICATE a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) within the longest of any of the following three **TIME PERIODS**: (1) **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer; (2) **TWO MONTHS** from the date of the notice of appeal; or (3) within the period for reply to the action from which this appeal was taken. **EXTENSIONS OF THESE TIME PERIODS MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1.  The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2.  The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).
3.  At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).
4.  The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)).
5.  The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).
6.  A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and
  - (a)  the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
  - (b)  the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
7.  The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).
8.  The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).
9.  Other (including any explanation in support of the above items): \_\_\_\_\_



JERRY D. JOHNSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1103

## NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF 37 CFR

### 1.192(c)

1. The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the invention defined in the claims involved in the appeal, which refers to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters as required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(5).

(5) *Summary of Invention.* A concise explanation of the invention defined in the claims involved in the appeal. This explanation is required to refer to the specification by page and line number, and, if there is a drawing, to the drawing by reference characters. Where applicable, it is preferable to read the appealed claims on the specification and any drawing. While reference to page and line number of the specification may require somewhat more detail than simply summarizing the invention, it is considered important to enable the Board to more quickly determine where the claimed subject matter is described in the application.

It appears that applicant is presenting arguments under the "Summary of the Invention" heading, rather than an actual summary of the invention.

2. The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review as required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(6).

(6) *Issues.* A concise statement of the issues presented for review. Each stated issue should correspond to a separate ground of rejection which appellant wishes the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to review. While the statement of the issues must be concise, it should not be so concise as to omit the basis of each issue. For example, the statement of an issue as "Whether claims 1 and 2 are unpatentable" would not comply with 37 CFR 1.192(c)(6). Rather, the basis of the alleged unpatentability would have to be stated, e.g., "Whether claims 1 and 2 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Smith in view of Jones," or "Whether claims 1 and 2 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as being based on a nonenabling disclosure." The statement would be limited to the issues presented, and should not include any argument concerning the merits of those issues.

3. The brief includes a statement that "appealed claims (Claims 32 through 69) to a very large extent do not stand or fall together", but fails to present reasons in support thereof as required under 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7). MPEP § 1206.

(7) *Grouping of Claims.* For each ground of rejection which appellant contests and which applies to a group of two or more claims, the Board shall select a single claim from the group and shall decide the appeal as to the ground of rejection on the basis of that claim alone, unless a statement is included that the claims of the group do not stand or fall together and, in the argument section of the brief (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)), appellant explains why the claims of the group are believed to be separately patentable. Merely pointing out differences in what the claims cover is not an argument as to why the claims are separately patentable. If an appealed ground of rejection applies to more than one claim and appellant considers the rejected claims to be separately patentable, 37 CFR

1.192(c)(7) requires appellant to state that the claims do not stand or fall together, and to present in the appropriate part or parts of the argument under 37 CFR 1.192(c)(8) the reasons why they are considered separately patentable.

The absence of such a statement and argument is a concession by the applicant that, if the ground of rejection were sustained as to any one of the rejected claims, it will be equally applicable to all of them. 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) is consistent with the practice of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit indicated in such cases as *In re Young*, 927 F.2d 588, 18 USPQ2d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Nielson*, 816 F.2d 1567, 2 USPQ2d 1525 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *In re King*, 801 F.2d 1324, 231 USPQ 136 (Fed. Cir. 1986); and *In re Sernaker*, 702 F.2d 989, 217 USPQ 1 (Fed. Cir. 1983). 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) requires the inclusion of reasons in order to avoid unsupported assertions of separate patentability. The reasons may be included in the appropriate portion of the "Argument" section of the brief. For example, if claims 1 to 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 and appellant considers claim 4 to be separately patentable from claims 1 to 3, he or she should so state in the "Grouping of claims" section of the brief, and then give the reasons for separate patentability in the 35 U.S.C. 102 portion of the "Argument" section (i.e., under 37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)(iii)).

In the absence of a separate statement that the claims do not stand or fall together, the

Board panel assigned to the case will normally select the broadest claim in a group and will consider only that claim, even though the group may contain two broad claims, such as "ABCDE" and "ABCDF." The same would be true in a case where there are both broad method and apparatus claims on appeal in the same group. The rationale behind the rule, as amended, is to make the appeal process as efficient as possible. Thus, while the Board will consider each separately argued claim, the work of the Board can be done in a more efficient manner by selecting a single claim from a group of claims when the appellant does not meet the requirements of 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

It should be noted that 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) requires the appellant to perform two affirmative acts in his or her brief in order to have the separate patentability of a plurality of claims subject to the same rejection considered. The appellant must (A) state that the claims do not stand or fall together and (B) present arguments why the claims subject to the same rejection are separately patentable. Where the appellant does neither, the claims will be treated as standing or falling together. Where, however, the appellant (A) omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) yet presents arguments in the argument section of the brief, or (B) includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) to the effect that one or more claims do not stand or fall together (i.e., that they are separately patentable) yet does not offer argument in support thereof in the "Argument" section of the brief, the appellant should be notified of the noncompliance as per 37 CFR 1.192(d). *Ex parte Schier*, 21 USPQ2d 1016 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1991); *Ex parte Ohsumi*, 21 USPQ2d 1020 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1991).